

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Applicant has submitted herewith three Replacement Sheets replacing the three sheets of drawings originally filed. The Replacement Sheets contain the identical drawing figures with no substantive changes except that the freehand drawing lines have been cleaned up by a professional draftsman. Applicant has responded to the examiner's drawing objections via amendments to the specification only.

REMARKS

Election/Restrictions

Applicant respectfully notes that the examiner's restriction/election of September 13, 2007, paragraph 4 regarding set I species A-G and set II species X and Y did not specify explicitly the grounds for the further restriction on page 2, paragraph 2 of the current Office action. Applicant when making the species election in its response based on the drawing figures among species A-G thus misunderstood what the examiner was relying on -- as explained by the examiner in the current Office action -- an election between a guide wire core including tactile surface contours (such as in claim 1) versus a smooth surface (such as Fig. 11). Applicant would therefore like to elect the species wherein the guide wire includes tactile surface contours as set forth in claim 1, for example.

Consistent with the above, applicant has amended claim 16. After entry of this amendment, claims 1-30 are pending, claims 1-3, 6-7, 10-17 are ready for examination, and claims 4-5, 8-9, 18-30 are withdrawn from consideration. Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner enter this amendment.

Drawings Objections

Applicant has amended the specification on page 12 to provide "In FIG. 17, guide wire core 98 [[96]] is fed" Applicant has amended the specification at page 9 to refer to reference number 32: "Furthermore, the guide wire 10 features a flattened distal tip 32 that extends into the solder ball 30." Accordingly, applicant has addressed each of the drawing objections via an amendment to the specification and without any changes to the drawings.

Applicant has nonetheless submitted herewith three Replacement Sheets replacing the three sheets of drawings originally filed. The Replacement Sheets contain the identical drawing figures with no substantive changes except that the freehand drawing lines have been cleaned up by a professional draftsman. Applicant requests that the examiner kindly enter the Replacement Sheet drawings.

Objections to the Specification

On page 6 of the specification, applicant has amended “pitted” to “pits.” On page 10, applicant has amended “wire core 68” to “wire core 64.” On page 16, applicant has amended “coatings” to “coating.” Also on page 16, applicant has in several occurrences amended “Teflon” to “TEFLON.”

Applicant regrets to errors in form and respectfully requests that the amendments be entered.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McMahon (U.S. Patent No. 6,296,616 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the examiner, McMahon teaches a substantially smooth exterior surface of the guide wire core, and the wavy contact regions 17 do not follow the surface of the core. In contrast, claim 1 provides a guide wire core “wherein at least a section of the elongated core includes *at least one of randomized and non-randomized tactile surface contours*; [and] an uninterrupted polymer coating with a generally constant outside diameter adhering to at least a portion of the elongated core and having a *surface contour that follows the at least one of randomized and non-randomized tactile surface*

